

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

aTX360
.U6N385
July 20
1990

CSF-1 87-91

NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

- DRAFT -

Prepared for:

**HUMAN NUTRITION INFORMATION SERVICE
NUTRITION MONITORING DIVISION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Prepared by:

**NATIONAL ANALYSTS
A Division of Booz•Allen & Hamilton Inc.**

JULY 20, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. APPROACH	2
A. Sample Selection	2
B. Data Collection Documents	3
C. Experimental Conditions	5
D. Data Collection	5
E. Data Preparation	6
III. RESULTS OF ATTEMPTED CONTACT IN THE NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY	9
A. More than 275 of the Targeted Households Were Interviewed Successfully in the Nonresponse Follow-Up Survey	9
B. Households from All the Initial CSFII Nonresponse Groups Were Reached and Represented among the Set of Households Interviewed in the Follow-Up Survey	10
C. The Proxy-Respondent Method Yields 16% More Interviews Due to the Inclusion of Neighborhood-Informant Data	10
IV. SURVEY ELIGIBILITY	15
A. Ninety Percent of Households in the Follow-Up Survey Could Have Been Contacted for the CSFII Interview	15
B. One-in-Three Households in the Low-Income Sample Qualified for Interview	15
V. CHARACTERISTICS OF NONRESPONSIVE HOUSEHOLDS	19
A. The Typical Eligible but Nonresponsive Household Is White, Has between 2 and 3 Persons and Is Headed By an Employed Adult in the Basic or an Unemployed/Retired Person in the Low-Income Sample	19
B. As with CSFII-Interviewed Households, Most Nonrespondents Have Moderate Incomes and Few Participate in Food-Benefits-Program	20
C. Most Nonresponse Follow-Up Households Are Satisfied with the Food Available to Them	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
VI. WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE	33
A. If the Right Approach Is Made, More Households Would Take Part in CSFII Interviewing	33
B. Length of the Interview Is the Greatest Barrier to CSFII Participation	34
C. Honorarium Payments of Up to \$20 Will Help to Increase the Likelihood of CSFII Participation for Some Households	34
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	43
A. Key Findings	43
B. Conclusions	44
APPENDIX A	45

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has instituted a national nutrition monitoring system in the form of the Continuing Survey of Food Intake By Individuals (CSFII). Every year two nationally representative samples of households are drawn in the conterminous U.S -- one focused on food-benefits-program-eligible households (e.g., food stamp) and the other includes all-income-level households. Throughout a 12-month period, homemakers and other family members are contacted and requested to report detailed information about the foods consumed in and away from home for three 24-hour periods -- the day before, the day of, and the day after the interview.

Not all sample households are successfully contacted or recruited into the survey. Some households cannot be reached after repeated attempts. Some choose not to take part, once they have been contacted, while others do not participate due to communication barriers. For these and other reasons, the CSFII, as with other surveys, must confront the issues of nonresponse and its implications for projectability of the survey results.

In its design of the CSFII, USDA has called for two follow-up survey efforts to be conducted with those sample households which were not included in the CSFII database. The follow-up surveys investigate in more detail the nonresponding households' characteristics. The first follow-up survey is to include a sample of such households from the first six months' portion of the CSFII (e.g., Waves 1 and 2). The second follow-up survey is to represent the nonresponding households assigned to the second six-month contact period (e.g., Waves 3 and 4).

In this, the first nonresponse follow-up survey to the CSFII, several objectives have been planned. The goals of this data collection are:

- To profile the characteristics of nonresponse households in terms of simple demographic, economic and food consumption patterns
- To set a baseline for comparisons between the interviewed and non-interviewed households, noting key differences, if any
- To gather information about the reasons for non-participation and incentives likely to induce greater cooperation with CSFII
- To assess the more effective approach to capturing information about these nonresponsive households -- repeated focused attempts to reach only these sample households versus use of neighbors as proxy respondents

The results of this first survey are the subject of this report.

II. APPROACH

This chapter outlines the overall design and implementation protocol for the first nonresponse follow-up survey to the CSFII. The plan called for selection of approximately 200 nonresponding households from Waves 1 and 2 of both the basic and low-income sample for a total of at least 400 potential households. Attempts are to be made to contact as many of these households as possible and to complete short interviews with them about sociodemographic characteristics and factors influencing participation with the larger food study. In half of the cases, only knowledgeable adult household members are to be invited to report information (household-only condition). In the remaining cases, if household members cannot be achieved, abbreviated interviews are sought from neighboring households (proxy-respondent condition) to gather partial data about the sample households.

A. Sample Selection

Selection of the 400 households for follow-up required resolution of several sampling issues. The initial sampling decisions centered around: 1) the identification of households eligible for inclusion in the survey of nonrespondents, 2) the distribution of these households by wave and by type of nonresponse, and 3) the number of candidate households to be selected for follow-up. The CSFII database recognizes the following field outcomes or results of call to sample households.

- Interview completed
- Screening completed, household ineligible*
- Screening completed, household refused interview
- Refused screening, screening incomplete
- Not screened, no one home
- Language barrier (household may or may not have completed screening)
- Vacant, not a housing unit
- Other reason for not interviewing

Clearly, households where interviews were completed or households in which the families do not qualify for interview were to be exempted from follow-up. Also excluded were vacant units and those places not properly classified originally as dwellings. In addition, a handful of other cases were held back from the frame for nonresponse follow-up. These were situations where, based on previous field experience, follow-up was known to be

*This outcome was possible only for households in the low-income (e.g., food-benefits-program-qualifying households) sample.

fruitless. For example, the area was the scene of an earlier riot and police had limited access to all interviewing efforts, another was a restricted-access community where entrance to the area was unattainable.*

The number of households eligible for inclusion in the follow-up by these definitions was 803, broken down by wave and reason for non-participation as shown in Table II-1. Because the distribution of reasons for nonresponse by wave was so very similar across waves for both quarters of the basic sample and for both waves of the low-income sample, it was decided to draw the same number of sample households from each wave.

In order to explore the issues regarding participation in CSFII-type interviews (e.g., the likelihood of future participation and the incentives which might motivate that decision) by the type of initial nonresponse, we believed it necessary to establish minimum numbers of completed interviews in each of these nonresponse categories. Therefore, in the cells with small numbers of nonrespondents we sampled all households, while in the larger cells we sampled roughly proportional to size.

The total number of households to include in our follow-up survey was governed by a desire to achieve at least 100 completed interviews with each type of sample household (e.g., basic and low-income) and our assumption that approximately 50% of those in the follow-up would yield an interview. A 50% "hit" rate appeared realistic, given that past experience with these households proved them to be difficult to reach and/or to interview. Therefore, the overall number of households drawn into this, the first, nonresponse follow-up survey for CSFII was 400, of which 200 were basic and 200 low-income sample households. The distribution of households put into the field by wave, type of sample and reason for nonresponse is given in Table II-2.

B. Data Collection Documents

The main survey instrument was a short interviewer-administered questionnaire. The topics included in the questionnaire were designed to identify characteristics of households that did not take part in CSFII, to explore factors which could motivate participation in such surveys, and to provide a bit of visibility on food consumption and expenditure patterns of these in surveyed families. In addition, information was sought as to whether or not the households would qualify for food-benefits-program-participation and, hence, to determine whether or not the households would have been eligible to take part in the low-income sample of the CSFII survey effort.

Specific areas covered in the interview were:

- Tenure at address

*Access to restricted buildings and restricted communities had been achieved in several area segments through diligent field efforts by interviewers and central office intervention with management. Limited access was a minor reason for CSFII non-participations and some restricted access cases were included in the follow-up where attempts at recontact were judged possible.

- Recall of solicitation for CSFII interviewing
- Reasons for not participating in CSFII
- Size of household
- Age and sex composition of household members
- Employment status of male and female heads of household
- Perception of food adequacy
- Food expenditure at home and away
- Ethnicity and race
- Benefits program participation
- Income

The first topic -- tenure at the address -- was used as a filter to identify only households which could have taken part, but did not, in Wave 1 or 2 CSFII. Persons who moved to the sample address subsequent to the date of the last attempted contact for a CSFII interview were interviewed, but their data was excluded from the major analyses of nonrespondents. The remainder of the topics were covered briefly in a few questions each. By design, the interview moved quickly -- no household was asked to give more than five to ten minutes of its time.

Two versions of the questionnaire were developed. The complete version covered all of the above topics and was addressed to a knowledgeable adult member of the sample household. The abbreviated version of the questionnaire contained only limited factual information about the sample household which a proxy, non-household member who knew the family could be reasonably expected to answer reliably (see experimental treatment below).

In addition to the questionnaire, a request letter on HNIS/USDA letterhead, hand-signed by Dr. Robert Rizek, Director/NMD, was shown to each potential respondent. The letter urged cooperation, promised anonymity and asserted the importance of full cooperation. Copies of the data collection documents are found in Appendix A.

Interviewers were trained through home study of an instructions manual. All were experienced CSFII interviewers and had been personally trained at the study's onset in food consumption interviewing procedures.

C. Experimental Conditions

USDA's Request for Proposals required an experimental approach be taken to collecting data about nonresponding CSFII households. Half of all households in the nonresponse survey were to be pursued for up to five attempted contacts before being considered unreachable. The remainder of the sample were to include the option of data collection from proxy respondents (for unreachable and uncooperative households). If the sample household could not be interviewed after three attempts, then a knowledgeable neighborhood informant was to be recruited to provide information about that household.

The advantage of the first approach -- household-only -- is that significant effort is made to retrieve detailed information about the family from the most informed, knowledgeable parties. However, many of these households had been subjected to extensive contacts and survey recruitment efforts already. They had resisted or avoided successfully prior efforts to gather information.

The second approach -- proxy respondent -- directed interviewers to neighbors when they were refused cooperation or failed to reach knowledgeable household members. This back-up source of information offers a greater likelihood that some information is gathered about most all households. However, the type of information that a neighborhood informant can be expected to provide is more circumscribed than that which is obtained from a household member directly. Therefore, this research approach gives up depth of information for increased household coverage.

D. Data Collection

Final approval of the survey instruments and survey protocol was secured by mid-December, 1989. Given the difficulties of conducting such interviews around the holiday season, it was decided to begin interviewing in January, 1990. Interviewing continued throughout a three-month period and the field closed on April 1, 1990. As all sample households had been assigned to the spring and summer waves of Year 1 CSFII interviewing, the length of time between the last CSFII contact and the nonresponse interview could have been as long as 12 months (e.g., a household that refused CSFII in April, 1989 and was not reached in the follow-up until the end of March, 1990) or as short as three months (e.g., the final "cleanup" effort for the summer wave was made at the end of September or early October 1989 and the follow-up nonresponse contact came about in early January, 1990.)

As an added incentive to complete the nonresponse interview, participants were given coupon holders as nominal thank-you gifts.

E. Data Preparation

All completed questionnaires and nonrespondent result-of-call forms were coded, keyed and cleaned. The nonresponse follow-up data were linked with information from the original CSFII screening (if available) and contact data (e.g., date of final call, result of final call). Simple marginal and cross-tabulation data runs were prepared and form the basis of this report.

Table II-1

**SAMPLE FRAME FOR NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
BY WAVE, TYPE OF SAMPLE AND
REASON FOR NONRESPONSE**

	BASIC						LOW-INCOME					
	#	Wave 1 %	#	Wave 2 %	#	Total %	#	Wave 1 %	#	Wave 2 %	#	Total %
Included in Nonresponse Frame												
Screening completed, interview not taken	98	15	112	17	210	16	47	3	34	2	81	2
Refused screening, screening incomplete	51	8	54	8	105	8	79	4	99	6	178	5
Not screened, no one home	34	5	33	5	67	5	35	2	58	4	93	3
Language barrier	17	3	-	-	17	1	12	1	4	*	16	*
Other including limited access	4	*	8	1	12	1	20	1	4	*	24	1
N =	(204)		(207)		(411)		(193)		(199)		(392)	
Excluded from Nonresponse Frame												
Interviewed, ineligible and vacants	448	69	465	69	913	69	1564	89	1346	87	2910	88
N =	(652)		(672)		(1324)		(1757)		(1545)		(3302)	

*Less than 0.5%.

Table II-2

**FIELDDED SAMPLE FOR NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
BY WAVE, TYPE OF SAMPLE AND
REASON FOR NONRESPONSE**

	BASIC			LOW-INCOME						
	Wave 1 #	Wave 1 %	Wave 2 # Wave 2 %	Total # Total %	Wave 1 # Wave 1 %	Wave 2 # Wave 2 %	Total # Total %			
Included in Nonresponse Frame										
Screening completed, interview not taken	49	44	45	45	26	21	24	23	50	22
Refused screening, screening incomplete	24	21	23	23	55	45	50	47	105	46
Not screened, no one home	21	19	18	18	23	19	23	19	46	20
Language barrier	16	14	0	0	12	10	4	10	16	7
Other	2	2	13	13	5	4	5	4	10	4
N =	(112)		(99)	(211)	(121)		(106)		(227)	

III. RESULTS OF ATTEMPTED CONTACT IN THE NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Success in interviewing CSFII sample households in the nonresponse follow-up survey is the subject of this chapter. Overall, a reasonably high proportion of the initially non-interviewed households were successfully reached and interviewed in the follow-up survey. Every category of initially nonresponsive households yielded interviews in the follow-up. The proxy-respondent method proved to be more effective in getting some information about the CSFII nonrespondent households than the household-only method because more households were covered successfully.

A. More than 275 of the Targeted Households Were Interviewed Successfully in the Nonresponse Follow-Up Survey

As Table III-1 shows fully, 63% of the households fielded in the nonresponse follow-up were contacted successfully and information gathered about their situations (either from them directly or from proxy respondents). This is considerably better than the initial 50% rate anticipated before the beginning of fieldwork.* A slightly higher interview rate is observed with basic sample (65%) than with low-income (61%) households, but this is a relatively small difference.

Approximately one-in-ten households refused to take part in this follow-up effort and an equally small proportion could not be reached after repeated attempts. Again, there appears to be no difference between the basic and low-income sample households in refusal and not-at-home rates.

Eight percent of the sample dwellings were vacant at the time of follow-up, with a higher rate of vacancy in the low-income sample (11%) than in the basic sample (6%). The delay in launching the follow-up accounts in part for the size of this figure. There was opportunity for more migration to occur, given the extended period between the end of CSFII and onset of the follow-up survey. In the future, the vacancy rate due to post-CSFII migration is likely to be somewhat less than in this, the first survey. However, migration is not the full story, 6 of the 37 sample dwellings that were vacant in the follow-up survey were classified in the CSFII as unreached because "no one home". It is likely that these were unoccupied dwellings -- erroneously judged nonresponsive during the CSFII fieldwork.

*One interviewer misunderstood the assignment. When a household member would indicate a willingness to participate in the CSFII food consumption survey (Q.3 of the nonresponse questionnaire) this interviewer completed the *food* questionnaire instead of the nonresponse interview. Four such surveys were completed before the interviewer learned of her mistake. These households are included in the "other" result-of-call coding. Had they answered only the nonresponse interview, the completion rate would have been slightly higher.

About half of the "other" results of call (3% or 14 sample households) come from samples lost in the mail.*

B. Households from All the Initial CSFII Nonresponse Groups Were Reached and Represented among the Set of Households Interviewed in the Follow-Up Survey

The results show that interviewers were effective in provoking participation in the follow-up survey from a good cross-section of households regardless of their initial reasons for not being part of the CSFII survey. Tables III-2 a and b demonstrate, first for the basic and then for the low-income sample, that the distribution of completed follow-up interviews roughly parallels the distribution of nonresponsive CSFII households put out for contact. For example, 68% of the basic households in the follow-up survey refused CSFII (either screening or interview). Of the follow-up interviews completed, 66% were from this group (46% refused the interview and 20% refused the screening). Nineteen percent of the basic households fielded in the follow-up were not at home at the time of CSFII contact. Seventeen percent of the completed nonresponse interviews were from this group.

Not surprisingly, there are consistent patterns of nonresponse at both the time of CSFII and of the follow-up survey. For example, among those who refuse even the follow-up interview, 75% refused the CSFII interview in the basic sample (40% refused interview and 35% the screening) and 82% refused in the low-income sample.

C. The Proxy-Respondent Method Yields 16% More Interviews Due to the Inclusion of Neighborhood-Informant Data

Remarkably, nearly the identical number of follow-up interviews were completed with household members under the two experimental conditions; where the increase in total number of completed interviews comes from is the proxy respondents from the neighborhood. As seen in Table III-3, of the 278 interviews completed 42% (or $n = 118$) were with the household-only approach and 41% ($n = 114$) were with a household member in the proxy-respondent approach. An additional 45 interviews (or 16% of the total) were taken with someone other than a household member. Therefore, it is clear that use of proxies helps to bolster the sample (even though not all of the desired information can be reported by these respondents).

*National Analysts moved offices during this period and an unusually large amount of mail could not be located, although good evidence pointed to the work actually being completed. This was a one-time, non-recurring problem.

Table III-1
RESULT-OF-CALL TO THE NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
BY TYPE OF SAMPLE

	Basic		All Low-Income		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>Nonresponse Follow-up Result-of-Call</u>						
Interview completed	138	65	140	61	278	63
Interview refused	20	9	28	12	48	11
No one home	19	9	20	9	39	9
Language barrier	-	-	4	2	4	1
Vacant	13	6	24	11	37	8
Other	21	10	12	5	33	7

Table III-2a

**RESULT-OF-CALL TO THE NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
BY TYPE OF NONRESPONSE TO
FINAL CSFII CONTACT**

- Basic -

CSFII Result-of-Call	Interviewed %	Nonresponse Follow-Up Result-of-Call				
		Interview Refused %	No One Home %	Language Barrier %	Vacant %	Other %
Screening completed, interview not taken	46	40	37	-	46	48
Refused screening, screening complete	20	35	32	-	23	19
Not screened, no one home	17	25	21	-	31	14
Language barrier	12	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	-	5	-	-	-
N =	(138)	(20)	(19)	(0)	(13)	(21)

Table III-2b

RESULT-OF-CALL TO THE NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
BY TYPE OF NONRESPONSE TO
FINAL CSFII CONTACT

- Low-Income -

	Nonresponse Follow-Up Result-of-Call					Other %
	Interviewed %	Interview Refused %	No One Home %	Language Barrier %	Vacant %	
<u>CSFII Result-of-Call</u>						
Screening completed, interview not taken	26	14	15	-	29	-
Refused screening, screening complete	40	68	40	25	58	67
Not screened, no one home	24	7	35	-	8	17
Language barrier	6	7	10	75	4	-
Other	5	4	-	-	-	16
N =	(14)	(28)	(20)	(4)	(24)	(12)

Table III-3

**NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS
BY TYPE OF SAMPLE AND
SOURCE OF INTERVIEW**

<u>Treatment Condition</u>	<u>Basic Sample %</u>	<u>All Low-Income Sample %</u>	<u>Total %</u>
Household-only method	42	43	43
Proxy-respondent method	58	57	57
• Household member	(41)	(42)	(41)
• Neighborhood informant	(17)	(15)	(16)
N =	(138)	(139)	(277)

IV. SURVEY ELIGIBILITY

Not all nonrespondents to the CSFII were eligible for the survey. In this chapter, we discuss the results of the examination of survey eligibility data. The nonresponse follow-up survey shows that the majority of the households recontacted would have been in residence at the time of the final CSFII attempted contacts. Hence, they would have been eligible to take part in the CSFII survey if they were in the basic sample portion of the study. However, of those in the low-income sample portion of the survey who were in residence, only about one-third would have qualified for CSFII interviewing. The majority of households not reached in the low-income sample would have screened out because their incomes relative to their household sizes is too large to qualify them for the CSFII survey.

A. Ninety Percent of Households in the Follow-Up Survey Could Have Been Contacted for the CSFII Interview

Households interviewed in the nonresponse follow-up were asked how long they had resided at their sample addresses. Households in residence during the month of the last CSFII attempted contact for interview were deemed eligible for contact and, potentially, for interview. As Table IV-1 shows, 90% of both the basic and low-income sample households in the follow-up survey were available for the CSFII survey effort.

B. One-in-Three Households in the Low-Income Sample Qualified for Interview

Not all of the households in residence at the time of the final CSFII contact were eligible for interview. In the low-income sample, only households meeting the income/household size criterion could be recruited for the CSFII study. Just over one-third of the low-income sample households interviewed in the follow-up survey and who were in residence at the point of last CSFII contact would have met the guidelines for CSFII interview eligibility (see Table IV-2). The majority of households in the low-income sample reported annual income levels in the follow-up survey which, when compared to the sizes of their households, were too high to allow them to qualify for food-benefits programs. Hence, they were too high to qualify the households for the CSFII interview. Even this figure overstates the CSFII eligibility rate, however, many follow-up survey households in the low-income sample were included because they were known to qualify for interview (e.g., those households in which screenings were completed but interviews not taken). Table IV-3 shows the eligibility rate in the low-income sample without these respondents. Here, 3 in 10 of the households are shown to qualify. All households in residence in the basic sample, of course, were eligible for interview.

Table IV-1

**NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP HOUSEHOLDS IN
RESIDENCE AT TIME OF FINAL
CSFII CONTACT BY SAMPLE TYPE**

	<u>Basic Sample</u> %	<u>All Low-Income Sample</u> %	<u>Total</u> %
Eligible, in residence	89	90	90
Not eligible, not in residence	11	10	10
N =	(138)	(139)	(277)

Table IV-2

**CSFII ELIGIBILITY
AMONG HOUSEHOLDS IN THE
NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY***

- Low-Income Sample -

<u>Interview Eligibility**</u>	<u>%</u>
Eligible	38
Ineligible	62
N =	(93)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Income/household size makes household eligible for food stamps.

Table IV-3
**CSFII ELIGIBILITY
 AMONG HOUSEHOLDS IN THE
 NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY***

*- Low-Income Sample -***

<u>Interview Eligibility***</u>	<u>%</u>
Eligible	30
Ineligible	70
N =	(67)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Excludes households screened, but refusing CSFII interview.

***Income/household size makes household eligible for food stamps.

V. CHARACTERISTICS OF NONRESPONSIVE HOUSEHOLDS

Profiling nonresponse households and comparing their characteristics to CSFII-interviewed households is the subject of this chapter. Select demographic, social and economic characteristics were examined among all households in residence at the time of the last CSFII attempted contact. The characteristics of the basic sample, as well as all low-income sample households and low-income interview-eligible households only, are reviewed.

Clear differences exist among nonrespondents by type of sample. There are more white households in the basic sample and more blacks and minorities among the low-income interview-eligible nonrespondents. The basic sample nonresponse follow-up households are smaller, more affluent and the heads of households are more likely to be working than are the households in the low-income interview-eligible sample, where food-benefits-program participation is greater and less money is spent on food at and away from home.

As compared to their interviewed counterparts, basic households in the nonresponse follow-up are very similar. In the low-income eligible sample, however, nonrespondents tend to be larger, have more retired heads of households, with lower income levels and greater benefits-program-participation rates.

A. The Typical Eligible but Nonresponsive Household Is White, Has between 2 and 3 Persons and Is Headed By an Employed Adult in the Basic Sample or an Unemployed/Retired Person in the Low-Income Sample

More than 80% of the CSFII nonresponse households that were interviewed in the follow-up survey are white, while a substantially larger proportion of the low-income eligible sample are black and other minorities (33% versus 17%) as shown in Table V-1. The unusually large percent of "something else" in the low-income sample (6%) is caused by two of the four eligible Hispanic households insisting on being classified not as white but as other. If they were white, then the distributions of race in the nonresponse follow-up would be reasonably similar to the distributions in the CSFII-interviewed sample for both the basic and the low-income surveys.

As with the general population and the CSFII responding households, more than 90% of the nonresponsive households are non-Hispanics (see Table V-2). Seven percent of the nonrespondents to the basic CSFII interview are Hispanic, as are 7% of all households in the low-income sample base. However, a slightly higher proportion (11%) of the income-qualifying (i.e., interview-eligible) households in the low-income sample are of Hispanic origin. These proportions are similar to those found among the CSFII-interviewed population (7% versus 8% Hispanic in the basic and 11% versus 10% in the low-income interview-eligible sample).

In terms of household size, the nonrespondents in the basic sample are smaller, on average, than those eligible households in the low-income sample (see Table V-3). The average number of persons in a household in the basic sample is 2.72 in the nonresponse follow-up

survey (and 2.67 among CSFII-interviewed households). Among income-qualifying households in the low-income sample, the average is 3.26 persons in the nonresponding households which is larger than the average CSFII participating household (2.51) by a sizable amount.* This is because there are fewer one- and two-person households in the nonresponse follow-up (54% versus 62%) and twice as many six-or-more person households (11% versus 5% than in the low-income interviewed sample).

As shown in Table V-4, most of the male and female heads of households in the basic portion of the nonresponse follow-up households were working at the final attempt to recruit them into the survey. Three out of four males and over 60% of the females reported working during the month when the CSFII contact was made. This is a higher percentage of working heads than reported by households interviewed in the basic CSFII sample. Among interviewed households, approximately equal proportions of male heads worked (73% in the follow-up, 71% in the CSFII); however, more working women and fewer homemakers (63% and 17%, respectively) were found among the nonrespondent households than among those completing the CSFII interview (49% and 29%).

The picture is different for the low-income portion of the nonresponse follow-up (see Table V-5). Here, only a third of the male heads and a quarter of the female heads were working during the month the final attempts were made to conduct CSFII interviews with them. Nearly half of the males were retired (32%), laid off or looking for work (16%), while the most common response among the females was keeping house (32%). Among the CSFII low-income survey participants, more male heads were working (44%) and fewer were retired or seeking employment (34%). Among the females, more were keeping house (44%) and fewer were retired (18%). It may well be that the CSFII-interviewed households are older and, hence, smaller and more likely to be headed by retired respondents than are the households found in the nonrespondent follow-up survey.

B. As with CSFII-Interviewed Households, Most Nonrespondents Have Moderate Incomes and Few Participate In Food-Benefits-Program

As expected, the income levels of the nonresponse follow-up households are markedly different by type of sample (see Table V-6). In the basic sample, just over one-third of the households report annual incomes for 1989 below \$15,000, while one-third report annual resources totaling \$35,000 or more. This distribution is not unlike the distribution of 1988 income reported by the CSFII participants in the basic sample.

On the other hand, in the low-income sample almost all interview-qualifying nonrespondent households (96%) report less than \$15,000 annual income. This is even higher than among CSFII-interviewed low-income sample households, where 89% of the respondents

*Comparisons are drawn between the size of households at the point of final CSFII contact as reported on the screening questionnaire and at the time of the nonresponse interview. The results show that these households remained mostly stable between the two time periods. The changes noted, for the most part, are small, as would be the case with the addition of a new infant or an adult child leaving home. The one exception to this is the household which grew to 19 when the sister, brother-in-law and their numerous children moved in subsequent to the last CSFII contact.

report income levels at or below \$15,000. Again, these differences may reflect the larger proportion of retired, fixed income households in the nonresponse follow-up survey.

When income levels are compared with household size to determine benefits program qualification, 23% of the nonresponse follow-up households in the basic sample are shown to be eligible for food stamps (see Table V-7). Over one-third of all sample households in the low-income sample would qualify and, of course, all of the interview-eligible households met the program participation criterion.*

Participation rates in benefits programs is significantly lower than the eligibility rates among nonresponding households (see Table V-8). Only 7% of the basic and 38% of the low-income nonresponse follow-up households report receiving food stamps at the current time. Even fewer report receiving WIC benefits at the present (3% and 6%, respectively). This is roughly comparable to the participation rates among CSFII basic survey respondents, but higher than reported by low-income sample interviewed households. These findings are consistent with the lower income levels reported by nonrespondent households; they have fewer dollars available to meet their requirements.

C. Most Nonresponse Follow-Up Households Are Satisfied with the Food Available to Them

Nonresponse follow-up households in the basic sample are satisfied with their food availability (see Table V-9). Four out of five basic nonresponse households report having enough and the kinds of foods they want to eat. On the other hand, among the low-income sample nonresponse follow-up households, only two-thirds report having enough of the kinds of food they want, but like the basic sample households, merely 3% report not having enough to eat.

Among the CSFII-interviewed households, more report having enough but not what they want to eat than are found among the nonresponse follow-up group. In the basic sample, 22% say this (as compared to 16% of the nonresponse follow-up households), and 39% of the low-income households (versus 31% in the nonresponse group) make this comment.

The average weekly expenditure for food and beverage at home among households in the nonresponse follow-up is \$65.70, with basic households spending markedly more than low-income households (\$71.74 versus \$49.31). The average expenditure for food and beverage away from home is \$23.69 for CSFII nonrespondents and, again, basic sample households spend more than do interview-eligible households in the low-income sample (\$24.13 versus \$8.27). (NOTE: Directly comparable summary questions are not available for CSFII-interviewed households.)

*This was the definition of interview eligibility.

Table V-1

RACE OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP AND
CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE

	Nonresponse Follow-Up*			CSFII Interviewed	
	Basic Sample %	Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Basic Sample %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %
White	83	79	66	86	72
Black	11	19	26	9	21
Asian/Pacific Islands	6	1	3	2	2
Eskimo, Native American	0	0	0	***	2
Something else	0	2	6	3	2
N =	(120)	(124)	(35)	(737)	(446)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

***Less than 0.5%.

Table V-2
HISPANIC ORIGINS OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
AND CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE

	Nonresponse Follow-Up*			CSFII Interviewed	
	Basic Sample %	Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Basic Sample %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %
Hispanic	7	7	11	8	10
Non-Hispanic	93	93	89	92	90
N =	(117)	(125)	(35)	(737)	(451)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table V-3

**CSFII NONRESPONSE AND INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS
BY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD AND SAMPLE TYPE**

	Nonresponse Follow-Up*			CSFII Interviewed	
	Basic Sample %	Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Basic Sample %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %
One person	24	34	43	23	38
Two persons	28	22	11	32	24
Three persons	20	18	14	19	13
Four to five persons	23	19	20	22	21
Six or more persons	6	7	11	4	5
Mean =	2.72	2.75	3.26	2.67	2.51
N =	(123)	(123)	(35)	(740)	(453)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table V-4

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MALE AND FEMALE
HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD IN NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
AND CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS

- Basic Sample -

Employment Status at Date of Final CSFII Attempted Contact	Nonresponse Follow-Up*		CSFII Interviewed	
	Male Head %	Female Head %	Male Head %	Female Head %
Working	73	63	71	49
Looking for work/laid off	0	1	3	2
Attending school	2	0	1	2
Keeping house	0	17	1	29
Retired	18	17	19	13
Disabled	6	2	4	3
Doing something else	1	1	1	2
N =	(90)	(108)	(541)	(643)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

Table V-5

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF MALE AND FEMALE
HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD IN NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
AND CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS

- *Low-Income Eligible Sample* -

Employment Status at Date of Final CSFII Attempted Contact	Nonresponse Follow-Up*		CSFII Interviewed	
	Male Head %	Female Head %	Male Head %	Female Head %
Working	32	23	44	20
Looking for work/laid off	16	0	10	4
Attending school	5	6	6	6
Keeping house	0	32	2	44
Retired	32	26	24	18
Disabled	11	6	13	6
Doing something else	5	6	**	1
N =	(19)	(226)	(388)	

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Less than 0.5%.

Table V-6

INCOME OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
AND CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE

Annual Income	Nonresponse Follow-Up*			CSFII Interviewed	
	Basic Sample %	Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Basic Sample %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %
Less than \$10,000	22	32	82	21	71
\$10,000 to \$14,999	14	12	14	12	18
\$15,000 to \$19,999	10	12	4	8	6
\$20,000 to \$34,999	23	15	0	27	4
\$35,000 to \$49,999	13	16	0	15	***
\$50,000 or more	17	13	0	17	***
	N = (69)	(75)	(28)	(662)	(421)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

***Less than 0.5%.

Table V-7

**FOOD STAMP QUALIFYING HOUSEHOLDS
IN THE NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP*
BY SAMPLE TYPE**

	<u>Basic Sample</u> %	<u>All Low-Income Sample</u> %	<u>Eligible Low-Income Sample</u> %
Eligible	23	38	100
Ineligible	77	62	0
N =	(93)	(93)	(35)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

Table V-8

**BENEFITS-PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP AND
CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE**

	Nonresponse Follow-Up*			CSFII Interviewed	
	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Basic Sample %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %
Benefits Program					
- Food stamps	7	13	38	7	24
- WIC	3	2	6	4	9
N =	(100)	(103)	(33)	(695)	(445)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table V-9

**FOOD ADEQUACY OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP
AND CSFII-INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE**

	<u>Nonresponse Follow-Up*</u>		<u>CSFII Interviewed</u>	
	<u>Basic Sample %</u>	<u>Eligible Low-Income Sample %</u>	<u>Basic Sample %</u>	<u>Eligible Low-Income Sample %</u>
Enough of the kinds of food we want to eat	82	66	75	51
Enough but not always what we want to eat	16	31	22	39
Sometimes not enough to eat	2	3	2	7
Often not enough to eat	0	0	1	3
	N = (100)	(35)	(740)	(452)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

Table V-10

**WEEKLY EXPENDITURES FOR FOOD AT HOME
OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP** HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE**

	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Total %
Less than \$20	2	7	13	5
\$20 to \$39	22	20	28	21
\$40 to \$59	18	26	25	22
\$60 to \$79	22	25	19	23
\$80 to \$124	24	16	16	20
\$25 or more	13	6	0	10
Mean =	\$71.74	\$59.84	\$49.31	\$65.70
N =	(93)	(95)	(32)	(189)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table V-11

WEEKLY EXPENDITURES FOR FOOD AWAY FROM HOME
OF NONRESPONSE FOLLOW-UP* HOUSEHOLDS
BY SAMPLE TYPE

	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Total %
\$0	13	19	27	16
\$1 to \$9	13	16	33	14
\$10 to \$19	25	19	24	22
\$30 to \$49	12	9	0	11
\$50 to \$74	6	15	3	11
\$75 or more	4	5	0	6
Mean =	\$24.13	\$23.26	\$8.27	\$23.69
N =	(93)	(95)	(35)	(188)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

VI. WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE

In this chapter we treat household willingness to participate in a CSFII food consumption survey and the nature of the incentives/barriers to that participation. These questions were addressed to sample household members (in both the household-only and proxy-respondent conditions) who were residing at the sample address at the time of the last CSFII contact. The purpose of limiting analyses to this group is to take the measure of only those households who for whatever reason resisted prior interviewing attempts. While some of these households may have proven to be ineligible for the low-income sample interview, they would have qualified for the basic survey and their reasons for nonresponse may help to understand future approaches to be made to all income sample households.

Approximately half the residence-eligible households acknowledge CSFII interview recruitment efforts. Among those not reached, over half would consider taking part if invited. For those who either did not cooperate previously or who now state they would not be likely to take part in the CSFII survey, interview length is the primary barrier. Apathy and perceived physical limitations also play a role in inhibiting respondent participation. Monetary incentives may help to overcome these barriers for at least some nonparticipants.

A. If the Right Approach Is Made, More Households Would Take Part in CSFII Interviewing

Of those households in residence at the time of the final CSFII contact, over half (56%) stated they were not aware of being asked to participate (Table VI-1). If they had been invited to complete the CSFII interview, more than half of this group report they might be willing to take part in such a survey (see Table VI-2). Households in the low-income sample (regardless of eligibility) appear more likely than those in the basic sample to consider being interviewed (60% versus 49%, respectively).

Surprisingly, households which initially refused the screening and/or in-depth CSFII interview are almost as likely to indicate an interest in the interview as those which had not participated in CSFII for some other reason. As Table VI-3 shows, 55% of those refusing the CSFII interview after completing the screening, 47% of those refusing the screening, and 57% of the other nonrespondents state they would be likely or very likely to take part in a food study. Since this question was posed to only those who were unaware of any prior solicitation (and refusal) to participate by their households, their expression of interest in the survey is unexpected. It is possible that different members of these households are making different decisions about cooperation at different time periods. This would suggest overtures could be made successfully to the same households at different times and to different "gatekeepers" even after refusals have been encountered.*

*It should be noted, that in many cases multiple refusal conversion attempts were made and some such attempts had already netted completed interviews as well as hard core refusals.

B. Length of the Interview Is the Greatest Barrier to CSFII Participation

Those who acknowledged being asked to take part in CSFII but who did not do so, as well as those who were not aware of being asked but who indicated they would be unlikely or very unlikely to participate, were questioned about the barriers to their participation. Overwhelmingly, the single most frequently cited obstacle was the length of interview. Nearly half (47%) stated the interview was too long, this response being much more prevalent among households in the basic than in the low-income sample (58% versus 35%, respectively) (see Table VI-4).

Apathy was a second widely given reason for not participating or not being likely to participate in CSFII. About a quarter of these households indicated they were either disinterested in the topic of food consumption or they could not (or would not) be bothered with the research for other unspecified reasons. One in eight felt they had some physical problem (e.g., hard of hearing, visual impairment, "too old") which created a barrier for them and precluded their participation. Only a tiny group stated resistance to government surveys as their reason for nonparticipation -- and all of these households were in the all-income (i.e., basic sample) portion of the survey.

Table VI-5 shows the stated reasons for nonparticipation by type of initial nonresponse (e.g., final result of call in CSFII). Not unexpectedly, those who refused to even complete the CSFII screening effort give apathy as their reason for nonresponse (17% not interested in the topic and 20% could not be bothered). On the other hand, those completing the screening but refusing the interview more often cite the length of the interview (57%) as that which inhibited their cooperation. Their interest may have been peaked enough to carry them through the screening but flagged when they became aware of the time commitment required for the interview.

C. Honorarium Payments of Up to \$20 Will Help to Increase the Likelihood of CSFII Participation for Some Households

When asked if a monetary incentive would have influenced their decision about CSFII, 30% of these households indicated they would have taken part if payment were offered them. This response appears to be related to eligibility in the low-income sample but independent of reason for the household's original nonresponsiveness (see Table VI-6 and VI-7).

Among those who would participate if compensated for their effort, half ($n = 16$) thought \$20 or less would suffice (see Table VI-8). The smallest amount mentioned as compensation was \$2, while the largest incentive sought was \$200 (each cited by only one household). It should be remembered that this question was raised only with those who said they did not or would not be likely to participate. A sizable group of households in the nonresponse follow-up expressed a willingness to participate, if asked, without monetary incentives being offered.

Table VI-1

**AWARENESS OF INVITATION TO TAKE PART
IN CSFII BY TYPE OF SAMPLE***

	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Total %
Aware	53	36	40	44
Not aware/don't know	47	64	60	56
N =	(100)	(105)	(35)	(205)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table VI-2

LIKELIHOOD OF TAKING PART IN A FOOD SURVEY
BY TYPE OF SAMPLE*

Likelihood of Taking Part in Survey	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Total %
Very likely	15	15	24	15
Likely	34	45	52	40
Unlikely	26	30	24	28
Very unlikely	26	10	0	17
N =	(47)	(67)	(21)	(114)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who thought they had *not* been invited to take part in the survey.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table VI-3

LIKELIHOOD OF TAKING PART IN A FOOD SURVEY
BY TYPE OF NONRESPONSE TO
FINAL CSFII CONTACT*

<u>Likelihood Of Taking Part in Survey</u>	<u>Final CSFII Result-of-Call</u>				
	<u>Screening Completed Interview Not Taken %</u>	<u>Refused Screening, Screening Incomplete %</u>	<u>Not Screened, No One Home %</u>	<u>Language Barrier %</u>	<u>Other %</u>
Very likely	17	15	9	8	33
Likely	38	32	47	50	42
Unlikely	29	35	31	17	8
Very unlikely	17	18	13	25	17
N =	(24)	(34)	(32)	(12)	(12)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who thought they had not been invited to take part in the survey.

Table VI-4

**REASONS FOR NON-PARTICIPATION
IN A FOOD SURVEY
BY TYPE OF SAMPLE***

Reasons	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Total*** %
Interview too long	58	35	22	47
Not interested in topic	14	15	17	14
Could not be bothered	15	8	6	12
Physical problems	14	10	6	12
Does not give interviews	7	8	0	7
Does not give government interviews	4	0	0	2
Eat out most of the time	4	3	0	4
Not asked	7	4	22	10
Other reasons	12	28	34	19
N =	(73)	(62)	(18)	(135)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who refused or would be unlikely or very unlikely to take part in the survey.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

***May exceed 100% due to multiple responses.

Table VI-5

**REASONS FOR NON-PARTICIPATION IN A FOOD SURVEY
BY TYPE OF NONRESPONSE TO FINAL CSFII CONTACT***

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Final CSFII Result-of-Call</u>			
	<u>Screening Completed Interview Not Taken**</u> %	<u>Refused Screening, Screening Incomplete</u> %	<u>Not Screened, No One Home</u> %	<u>Language Barrier</u> % <u>Other</u> %
Interview too long	57	37	52	25
Not interested in topic	13	17	5	25
Could not be bothered	3	20	14	50
Physical problems	21	2	10	-
Does not give interviews	2	12	10	25
Does not give government interviews	3	2	-	-
Eat out most of the time	5	2	5	-
Not asked	5	10	-	25
Other reasons	15	24	24	-
N =	(61)	(41)	(21)	(8) (4)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who refused or would unlikely or very unlikely to take part in the survey.
 **May exceed 100% due to multiple responses.

Table VI-6

**WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN A FOOD SURVEY
IF PAYMENT OFFERED BY TYPE OF SAMPLE***

	Basic Sample %	All Low-Income Sample** %	Eligible Low-Income Sample %	Total %
Yes	31	30	47	30
No	69	70	53	70
N =	(72)	(63)	(19)	(135)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who refused or would be unlikely or very unlikely to take part in the survey.

**Includes households that are eligible and ineligible for low-income sample interview.

Table VI-7

WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN A FOOD SURVEY
IF PAYMENT OFFERED BY TYPE OF NONRESPONSE
TO FINAL CSFII CONTACT*

	Screening Completed Interview Not Taken %	Final CSFII Result-of-Call			
		Refused Screening, Screening Incomplete %	Not Screened, No One Home %	Language Barrier %	Other %
Yes	34	28	27	25	25
No	66	72	73	75	75
N =	(62)	(39)	(22)	(8)	(4)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who refused or would be unlikely or very unlikely to take part in the survey.

Table VI-8

**HOW MUCH COMPENSATION IS REQUIRED FOR
FOOD INTERVIEW AMONG THOSE WHO DID NOT
OR WHO WERE NOT LIKELY TO TAKE PART***

	<u>%</u>
Under \$6	9
\$6 to \$10	12
\$11 to \$20	28
\$21 to \$50	32
\$51 or more	19
N =	(32)

*Households in residence at date of final CSFII attempted contact who refused or would be unlikely or very unlikely to take part in the survey.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The nonresponse follow-up survey was requested to provide information about those not successfully recruited into Waves 1 and 2 of CSFII. A sampling of all types of productive nonrespondent households were selected into the sample to be interviewed briefly, either directly or through a proxy respondent.

A. Key Findings

- A sizable proportion of previously nonresponsive households were successfully interviewed in the follow-up (63%).
- All types of CSFII nonrespondents were successfully pursued and interviewed in the follow-up.
- Use of the proxy added importantly to the coverage of nonrespondents. A 16% increase in the number of previous nonrespondents were reached using proxies.
- A sizable portion of the low-income sample CSFII nonrespondents would not have been eligible for interview if they had been reached because their income levels were too high relative to their household sizes.
- Nonrespondent households in the basic and low-income samples are markedly different. Basic sample nonrespondents are predominantly white, with less than three people, headed by a working male or female. They are of moderate income and evince low participation rates in food-benefits program.

Low-income sample nonrespondents who are eligible for the CSFII interview, are more heavily black and of minority races, contain more than three persons, on average, and have nonworking heads of households. These households spend less than their basic counterparts on food at and away from home and show high rates of food-benefits-program participation, especially the food stamp program.

- In the basic sample, respondents and nonrespondents to the CSFII are, for the most part, demographically similar. However, compared to CSFII participants, the non-response follow-up households in the low-income sample are different. The nonrespondents have larger households, are more likely to be retired persons, have lower income levels and report higher rates of food stamp participation.
- The single, biggest barrier to CSFII participation is length of interview, with apathy and physical disabilities also appearing as factors.
- Financial incentives are likely to motivate more households to participate.

B. Conclusions

If these results continue to hold for the follow-up of CSFII nonrespondents in the second half of the year, then the following conclusions should be considered for continuing non-response surveys:

- Proxy respondents should be used with all nonrespondents in future nonresponse follow-up surveys.
- Increasing the honorarium to participating households may provoke higher completion rates.

APPENDIX A



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Human Nutrition
Information
Service

Nutrition
Monitoring
Division

Federal Building
Hyattsville, Maryland
20782

December 1989/January 1990

Dear Resident:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is required by law to conduct nationwide surveys about the foods and beverages people eat and drink. Information from the surveys is used to develop nutrition education programs, assess demands for agricultural products, and monitor the safety of the food supply.

Your address was scientifically chosen as part of the sample for our most recent survey. Earlier this year an interviewer from National Analysts, under contract with USDA, attempted to interview your household but was unable to do so. It is important for the accuracy of our survey that we obtain information about the households that we were unable to interview. This helps us to ensure that we are not missing an important segment of the population in our survey.

We would like you to answer just a few simple questions about your household. This will take no more than five minutes of your time and the answers you provide will be kept strictly confidential. While your participation is voluntary, it is important for the accuracy of the survey that we obtain this information.

Because this is so important, we have authorized National Analysts interviewers to give you a coupon holder to thank you for your time. We appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. RIZEK
Director

Study #09010-073-001
OMB #0586-0014
Expiration Date: 2/29/92
CD 01 1-2

aTX360
.U6N385
July 20
1990

CONTINUING SURVEY OF FOOD INTAKES BY INDIVIDUALS
- Follow-Up Survey I -

8-15 16-18

19~25

Interview Began:	AM	1
	PM	2
26~29		
Interview Ended:	AM	1
	PM	2
31~34		

BLANK 36

Respondent's Name: _____

Telephone Number: ()

Interviewer's Name: _____

Interviewer's ID #: _____ Date: _____/_____/19____

37-40 41-42 43-44 45-46

CALL REPORT FORM

Result of Call Codes*

- 1 = Interview completed
2 = Appointment made for interview
3 = Interview refused
4 = No one home
5 = Language barrier
6 = Vacant
0 = Other (EXPLAIN:)

47	1	2	3	4	5	6
Date 48~51						
Time 52~57	AM PM	AM PM	AM PM	AM PM	AM PM	AM PM
Result Code* 58						

INTRODUCTION: (ASK TO SPEAK WITH THE FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD. IF NOT AVAILABLE ASK FOR A KNOWLEDGEABLE ADULT 18 YEARS OLD OR OLDER) Hello, my name is _____ and I am in your area because we are doing a survey for the United States Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year we tried to contact your address for the food consumption survey. (SHOW LETTER) Your household was not able to take part at that time. Therefore, I am sorry but we cannot include your household in our results. However, in order to apply the findings to households like yours, I would like to fill in a few pieces of information about the people living here. (IF ASKED, SAY: All your answers will be kept confidential.)

To begin...

1. How long have you lived at this address?

NUMBER OF: _____
3-9

Months	1
Years	2

2. As far as you know, was your household invited to take part in a USDA survey about the foods eaten by your household? (IF ASKED SAY: That is, the Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals.)

(SKIP TO Q.4)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	3

3. If you had been invited, how likely or unlikely is it that your household would take part in a USDA survey about the foods eaten by your household; would you say: (READ)

(SKIP TO Q.7)

Very likely,	1
Likely,	2
Unlikely, or	3
Very unlikely?	4

4. What is the main reason why your household (did not/would not be likely to) take part in a USDA food consumption survey? (PROBE: Any other reasons?)

5. If we were allowed to pay you for taking part in a USDA food consumption survey, would you have agreed to be interviewed? (PROBE: Which is more likely, that you would or would not have taken part?)

(SKIP TO Q.7)

Yes	1
No	2

6. How much money would you require to take part in the survey?

\$.00

16-18

7. How many people regularly live in this household?

NUMBER OF PEOPLE:

19-20

8. How many of these people are: (TOTAL PEOPLE SHOULD BE THE SAME AS NUMBER IN Q.7)

(READ)	Males	Females
Under 15 years?	21	22
15 to 24 years?	23	24
25 to 44 years?	25	26
45 to 64 years?	27	28
65 years or over?	29	30
TOTAL	31	32

9. (IF NO MALES OVER 15 YEARS IN Q.8, SKIP TO Q.10, OTHERWISE, ASK:) In (MONTH OF LAST CONTACT ON LABEL), was the male head of household: (READ) (IF MORE THAN ONE ACTIVITY, SAY: What was his primary activity?)

Working,	1
Looking for work or laid off,	2
Attending school,	3
Keeping house,	4
Retired,	5
Disabled and unable to work, or	6
Doing something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0

35

10. (IF NO FEMALES OVER 15 YEARS IN Q.8, SKIP TO Q.11; OTHERWISE, ASK:) In (MONTH OF LAST CONTACT ON LABEL), was the female head of household: (READ) (IF MORE THAN ONE ACTIVITY, SAY: What was her primary activity?)

37

Working,	1
Looking for work or laid off,	2
Attending school,	3
Keeping house,	4
Retired,	5
Disabled and unable to work, or	6
Doing something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0

38

11. Which one of the following statements best describes the food eaten in your household: (READ)

39

Enough of the kinds of food we want to eat,	1
Enough but not always what we want to eat,	2
Sometimes not enough to eat, or	3
Often not enough to eat?	4

12. How much money does your household usually spend for food and beverages eaten at home? (Regardless of where the foods/beverages were purchased or prepared).

43

\$.00 per
40-42

Week	1
Month	2

13. And how much money does your household usually spend for food and beverages bought and eaten away from home?

47

\$.00 per
44-46

Week	1
Month	2

14. Is the head of household: (READ)

43

White,	1
Black,	2
Asian/Pacific Islands,	3
Aleut, Eskimo, American Indian, or	4
Something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0

15. Is the head of household: (READ)

43

Hispanic (such as Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican or Latin American), or	1
Not Hispanic?	2

16. This past (MONTH OF LAST CONTACT ON LABEL), did anyone in your household receive: (READ)

	Yes	No
Food stamps?	1 ₅₀	2
WIC benefits?	1 ₅₁	2

17. CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLD FROM Q.7, THEN INSERT THE DOLLAR AMOUNT SHOWN DIRECTLY BELOW, IN THE BOX IN THE QUESTION. READ Q.17.

# of People <small>52-53</small>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Yearly Income	\$7,777	\$10,427	\$13,080	\$15,735	\$18,385	\$21,035	\$23,365	\$26,340	\$28,990

# of People <small>52-53</small>	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Yearly Income	\$31,645	\$34,295	\$36,950	\$39,600	\$42,250	\$44,905	\$47,555	\$50,210

Last year, was the total income received by all members of this household before taxes and other deductions greater than or less than \$? Do not include food stamps or WIC benefits. Do include salaries and wages, Social Security, other benefit checks and the like.

Greater than	1
Less than	2
Exactly equal to	3

18. (SHOW CARD A) For classification purposes, which letter includes your household's total income for last year? (CIRCLE CODE NUMBER)

A	B	C	D	E	F
1	2	3	4	5	6

55

55

Respondent refused	9
--------------------	---

INTERVIEWER NOTES: THANK RESPONDENT AND COMPLETE CALL REPORT FORM ON PAGE 1. MAKE COMMENTS HERE THAT WILL HELP UNDERSTAND THE RESPONSES IN THIS INTERVIEW.

CONTINUING SURVEY OF FOOD INTAKES BY INDIVIDUALS
- Follow-Up Survey II -

3-15

15-18

3-7

19-25

[Empty box for respondent information]

Interview Began:	AM	1
	PM	2
25-29		
Interview Ended:	AM	1
	PM	2
31-34		

Respondent's Name: _____

Respondent is:

Household member?	1
Neighborhood informant?	2

Telephone Number: () _____
AREA CODE

Interviewer's Name: _____

Interviewer's ID #: _____ Date: ____/____/19

37-40

41-42

43-44

45-46

IF RESPONDENT IS:

- . HOUSEHOLD MEMBER, ASK Q'S 1-18
- . NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMANT, ASK Q'S 19-25

CALL REPORT FORM

Result of Call Codes*

- 1 = Interview completed
2 = Appointment made for interview
3 = Interview refused
4 = No one home
5 = Language barrier
6 = Vacant
0 = Other (EXPLAIN:)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Date						
48-51						
Time	AM	AM	AM	AM	AM	AM
52-57	PM	PM	PM	PM	PM	PM
Result Code*						
58						

INTRODUCTION: (ASK TO SPEAK WITH THE FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD. IF NOT AVAILABLE ASK FOR A KNOWLEDGEABLE ADULT 18 YEARS OLD OR OLDER) Hello, my name is _____ and I am in your area because we are doing a survey for the United States Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year we tried to contact your address for the food consumption survey. (SHOW LETTER) Your household was not able to take part at that time. Therefore, I am sorry but we cannot include your household in our results. However, in order to apply the findings to households like yours, I would like to fill in a few pieces of information about the people living here. (IF ASKED, SAY: All your answers will be kept confidential.)

To begin...

1. How long have you lived at this address?

NUMBER OF: _____
8-9

Months	1
Years	2

2. As far as you know, was your household invited to take part in a USDA survey about the foods eaten by your household? (IF ASKED SAY: That is, the Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals.)

(SKIP TO Q.4)

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	3

3. If you had been invited, how likely or unlikely is it that your household would take part in a USDA survey about the foods eaten by your household; would you say: (READ)

(SKIP TO Q.7)

Very likely,	1
Likely,	2
Unlikely, or	3
Very unlikely?	4

4. What is the main reason why your household (did not/would not be likely to) take part in a USDA food consumption survey? (PROBE: Any other reasons?)

5. If we were allowed to pay you for taking part in a USDA food consumption survey, would you have agreed to be interviewed? (PROBE: Which is more likely, that you would or would not have taken part?)

(SKIP TO Q.7)

Yes	1
No	2

6. How much money would you require to take part in the survey?

\$.00
16~19

7. How many people regularly live in this household?

NUMBER OF PEOPLE:
19~20

8. How many of these people are: (TOTAL PEOPLE SHOULD BE THE SAME AS NUMBER IN Q.7)

(READ)	Males	Females
Under 15 years?	21	22
15 to 24 years?	23	24
25 to 44 years?	25	25
45 to 64 years?	27	23
65 years or over?	29	30
TOTAL	31	33
	32	34

9. (IF NO MALES OVER 15 YEARS IN Q.8, SKIP TO Q.10, OTHERWISE, ASK:) In (MONTH OF LAST CONTACT ON LABEL), was the male head of household: (READ) (IF MORE THAN ONE ACTIVITY, SAY: What was his primary activity?)

Working,	1
Looking for work or laid off,	2
Attending school,	3
Keeping house,	4
Retired,	5
Disabled and unable to work, or	6
Doing something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0
	35

10. (IF NO FEMALES OVER 15 YEARS IN Q.8, SKIP TO Q.11; OTHERWISE, ASK:) In (MONTH OF LAST CONTACT ON LABEL), was the female head of household: (READ) (IF MORE THAN ONE ACTIVITY, SAY: What was her primary activity?)

37	
Working,	1
Looking for work or laid off,	2
Attending school,	3
Keeping house,	4
Retired,	5
Disabled and unable to work, or	6
Doing something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0
38	

11. Which one of the following statements best describes the food eaten in your household: (READ)

39	
Enough of the kinds of food we want to eat,	1
Enough but not always what we want to eat,	2
Sometimes not enough to eat, or	3
Often not enough to eat?	4

12. How much money does your household usually spend for food and beverages eaten at home? (Regardless of where the foods/beverages were purchased or prepared).

\$ _____ .00 per
40-42

Week

Month

13. And how much money does your household usually spend for food and beverages bought and eaten away from home?

\$ _____ .00 per
44-46

Week

Month

14. Is the head of household: (READ)

White,	1
Black,	2
Asian/Pacific Islands,	3
Aleut, Eskimo, American Indian, or	4
Something else? (DESCRIBE:)	5

15. Is the head of household: (READ)

Hispanic (such as Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican or Latin American), or	1
Not Hispanic?	2

16. This past (MONTH OF LAST CONTACT ON LABEL), did anyone in your household receive: (READ)

	Yes	No
Food stamps? ₅₃	1	2
WIC benefits? ₅₁	1	2

17. CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLD FROM Q.7, THEN INSERT THE DOLLAR AMOUNT SHOWN DIRECTLY BELOW, IN THE BOX IN THE QUESTION. READ Q.17.

# of People 52-53	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Yearly Income	\$7,777	\$10,427	\$13,080	\$15,735	\$18,385	\$21,035	\$23,365	\$26,340	\$28,991

# of People 52-53	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Yearly Income	\$31,645	\$34,295	\$36,950	\$39,600	\$42,250	\$44,905	\$47,555	\$50,210

Last year, was the total income received by all members of this household before taxes and other deductions greater than or less than \$? Do not include food stamps or WIC benefits. Do include salaries and wages, Social Security, other benefit checks and the like.

Greater than	1
Less than	2
Exactly equal to	3

18. (SHOW CARD A) For classification purposes, which letter includes your household's total income for last year? (CIRCLE CODE NUMBER)

A	B	C	D	E	F
1	2	3	4	5	6

Respondent refused	9
--------------------	---

INTERVIEWER NOTES: THANK RESPONDENT AND COMPLETE CALL REPORT FORM ON PAGE 1. MAKE COMMENTS HERE THAT WILL HELP UNDERSTAND THE RESPONSES IN THIS INTERVIEW.

INTRODUCTION FOR NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMANT: (ASK TO SPEAK WITH SOMEONE WHO IS KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE SAMPLE H.U. AND WHO IS 18 YEARS OLD OR OLDER).

Hello, my name is _____ and I am in your area because we are doing a survey for the United States Department of Agriculture. Earlier this year we tried to contact the household at (ADDRESS ON LABEL) for the food consumption survey. (SHOW LETTER) That household was not able to take part at that time. In order to apply the findings to all households, I need a few pieces of information about the people living there and, since I cannot reach them, perhaps you could help me. (IF ASKED SAY: All your answers will be kept confidential.)

To begin....

19. About how long has the current household lived at (ADDRESS ON LABEL)? (PROBE: What is your best estimate?)

NUMBER OF: _____
8-9

Months	1
Years	2
Don't know	3

20. How many people regularly live in that household? BLANK 11-13

NUMBER OF PEOPLE: _____

13-20

21. How many of those people are:

(READ)

	Males	Females
Under 15 years?	21	22
15 to 24 years?	23	24
25 to 44 years?	25	26
45 to 64 years?	27	28
65 years or over?	29	30
TOTAL	31-32	33-34

22. (IF NO MALES OVER 15 YEARS IN Q.21, SKIP TO Q.23, OTHERWISE, ASK: Is the male head of household at (ADDRESS ON LABEL) usually: (READ) (IF MORE THAN ONE ACTIVITY, SAY: What was his primary activity?)

	Working,	1
	Looking for work or laid off,	2
	Attending school,	3
	Keeping house,	4
	Retired,	5
	Disabled and unable to work, or	6
	Doing something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0
(DO NOT READ)	Don't know	8

23. (IF NO FEMALES OVER 15 IN Q.21, SKIP TO Q.24, OTHERWISE, ASK:) Is the female head of household at (ADDRESS ON LABEL) usually: (READ) (IF MORE THAN ONE ACTIVITY, SAY: Which was her primary activity?)

	Working,	1
	Looking for work or laid off,	2
	Attending school,	3
	Keeping house,	4
	Retired,	5
	Disabled and unable to work, or	6
	Doing something else? (DESCRIBE:)	0
(DO NOT READ)	Don't know	8

BLANK 39-47

24. Is the head of that household: (READ)

	White,	1
	Black,	2
	Asian/Pacific Islands,	3
	Aleut, Eskimo, American Indian, or	4
	Something else? (DESCRIBE:)	5
(DO NOT READ)	Don't know	6

25. Is the head of that household: (READ)

	Hispanic (such as Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican or Latin American), or	1
	Not hispanic?	2
(DO NOT READ)	Don't know	3

INTERVIEWER NOTES: THANK RESPONDENT AND COMPLETE CALL REPORT FORM ON PAGE 1. MAKE COMMENTS HERE THAT WILL HELP UNDERSTAND THE RESPONSES IN THIS INTERVIEW.

BLANK 50-55

